



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-04

Paper No: 17

HENRY BRENDZEL
PO BOX 574
SPRINGFIELD NJ 07081

COPY MAILED

JUN 23 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Golestani :
Application No. 09/327,347 :
Filing Date: 5 June, 1999 :
Attorney Docket No. Golestani3 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 6 May, 2003, alleging, *inter alia*, unavoidable delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).

The Office regrets the delay in addressing this matter.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**, and the fee is charged as authorized to Deposit Account 50-0732.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the final Office action mailed on 6 June, 2002, with reply due absent extension of time on or before Friday, 6 September, 2002;
- the Examiner contacted Petitioner and a telephone interview was held on 7 January, 2003 (Summary mailed 8 January, 2003);
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 4 March, 2003;

- Petitioner's requests of 26 February, 2003, and 6 May, 2003, to withdraw the holding of abandonment were denied by the Group Director on 1 April, 2003, and 6 October, 2003, respectively, because: (a) the evidence in support of a showing that the Office received the reply (that Petitioner contended was timely filed) was unclear and insufficient; and (b) the reply, even if timely filed and received by the Office, was not a proper reply to a final Office action;¹
- Petitioner has made no further showing that his reply to the 6 June, 2002, final Office action was both timely and proper; and

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).²

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.³

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.⁴ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁵

¹ A proper reply is a an amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance, a Notice of Appeal, or a CPA or RCE (with fee and submission). (See: MPEP §711.03(c).)

² 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:
35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.
Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

³ Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

⁴ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 *Fed. Reg.* at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁵ See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁶ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁷))

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) are the petition and fee, a showing of unavoidable delay, a proper reply, and a terminal disclaimer where appropriate. Here the terminal disclaimer is unnecessary. Petitioner has filed the petition, fee and reply, but, as indicated above, has failed to carry his burden of proof as to the showing.

CONCLUSION

The instant petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) hereby must be and is **dismissed**.

The file is held in the Office of Petitions for consideration of another matter.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

⁷ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.